

CUJHSS, 2018; 12/1-2 (double issue): 67-84
Submitted: November 13, 2018
Accepted: November 27, 2018
ORCID#: 0000-0002-1697-4104

Translation as Intertextual Creativity: A Case Study on *La Galatea* in French and in Turkish¹

Metinlerarası Yaratıcılık Açısından Çeviri: Fransızca ve Türkçede *La Galatea* Üzerine Bir Çalışma

Günil Özlem Ayaydın Cebe
Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Turkey

Abstract

This paper contributes to the studies on translation practices in French and Ottoman literatures by closely investigating certain narratives that are intertextually linked. The first of them is Miguel de Cervantes's pastoral romance *La Galatea*, printed in 1585, as the author's first book. In 1783, the French author Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian takes the liberty to reconstruct the romance and completes the otherwise unfinished first volume. His *Galatée* attracts the attention of Şemseddin Sami, the Ottoman-Albanian writer and linguist, in 1873. The young enthusiast exercises an almost *mot-à-mot* linguistic transfer, however, reserving the translator's right to cultural assessment. Subsequently, an Armenian-Ottoman entrepreneur, Viçen Tilkiyan, concealing his true source, prints *Çoban Kızlar* in 1876 in Armeno-Turkish, and publishes its Ottoman-Turkish version next year. This research, by employing such concepts as authenticity, imitation, inspiration, self-censorship, and rewriting, investigates the diversifying concepts of translation in the European and the Ottoman contexts. It also discusses the intermingling of translation with original texts and vice versa, hence its accommodation of intertextual creativity.

Keywords: Translation, interculturality, 19th century Ottoman literature, Miguel de Cervantes, Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian, Şemseddin Sami, Viçen Tilkiyan.

Öz

Bu makalede, metinlerarası bağlarla ilişkilendirilmiş dört anlatının yakından incelenmesi yoluyla Fransız ve Osmanlı edebiyatlarında çeviri uygulamaları hakkındaki çalışmalara katkıda bulunmak amaçlanmıştır. Bunlardan ilki, Miguel de Cervantes'in ilk kitabı olarak 1585'te basılan *La Galatea* başlıklı pastoral romanıdır. Fransız yazar Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian, 1783 yılında bu romansa, deyim yerindeyse, bir nazire yazarak *Galatée* başlığıyla yayımlamıştır. Florian, daha kalabalık dolayısıyla entrika açısından daha karmaşık olan altı kitaplık *La Galatea*'yı bazı karakterleri çıkararak ve metni edebiyat üzerine tartışmaya dönüştüren sohbet kısımlarını atlayarak üç kitapta yoğunlaştırmış ve dördüncü kitapta romanın sonunu yazmıştır. Şemseddin Sami, 1873 yılında Florian'ın romanını Türkçeye çevirmiş, birkaç yerde dinî öğeleri

¹ The groundwork of this article is supported by TÜBİTAK 2219 International Postdoctoral Research Scholarship Program (Harvard University Center for Middle Eastern Studies, 2015-2016).

uyarlamak veya yok saymak dışında çoğunlukla kaynak metne bağlı kalmıştır. Viçen Tilkiyan'ın 1876 yılında Ermeni harfli, ertesi yıl Arap harfli Türkçe olarak yayımladığı *Çoban Kızlar* başlıklı yapıt da *Galatée*'nin son derece serbest bir çevirisidir. Bu niteliğiyle, Şemseddin Sami'nin görece sadık çevirisine karşılık, Osmanlı çeviri anlayışına daha uygun bir yeniden yazımdır. Bu yapıtların karşılaştırmalı olarak mercek altına alınması, yüzyıllara yayılmış metinlerarası bir serüveni gün ışığına çıkardığı gibi Avrupa'da ve Osmanlı'da çeviri etkinliğini daha iyi kavramayı sağlamaktadır. Makalede, esinlenme, otosansür, özgünlük, taklit ve yeniden yazım gibi kavramlar ışığında, çeviri metinlerin kaynak metinlerle kurduğu ilişki sorgulanmakta, çeviride metinlerarası yaratıcılığın yeri tartışılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çeviri, kültürlerarasılık, 19. yüzyıl Osmanlı edebiyatı, Miguel de Cervantes, Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian, Şemseddin Sami, Viçen Tilkiyan.

This is the story of four texts connected through approximately three centuries. It begins from the latest and perhaps the least valuable one from a literary point of view and moves towards the source: Viçen Tilkiyan's *Çoban Kızlar* (*Shepherdesses*, 1877) may not be a masterpiece of literature but it is possibly the most resourceful of them all, providing us with invaluable insight into the making of literature and culture via translation. Following the chronology backwards in the Ottoman context, Tilkiyan is predated by Şemsettin Sami, the Ottoman-Albanian writer and linguist. His *Galate* (1873) is a fairly loyal translation of the French author Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian's *Galatée* (1783) which is a rewriting of Cervantes's pastoral romance *La Galatea* (1585).

The story of the discovery of this intertextual chain deserves additional attention. Although merely weaving the threads of this historical narrative is compelling in its own right, it simultaneously presents a rich pattern to acknowledge translation from an intercultural perspective. Studying the four texts yields profound knowledge pertaining to translation in the European as well as the Ottoman contexts.

Viçen Tilkiyan is an Ottoman Armenian writer and publisher² whose literary corpus including several fictions, a tragedy and a number of essays on cultural and

² Despite his considerable contribution to the Ottoman literary universe, Tilkiyan is but a name in bibliographic records. The main sources on Armeno-Turkish figures, such as anthologies and dictionaries, do not cite his name. The main source on his work is the two bibliographies Hasmik Stepanyan prepared on Turkish books in Armenian letters. The second volume of Pars Tuğlacı's *Tarih Boyunca Batı Ermenileri* (*Western Armenians through History*), parallels Stepanyan's on a smaller scale, including bibliographic information and cover pages of books printed in Armeno-Turkish in the 19th century, together with some of Tilkiyan's. Seyfettin Özege's catalogue on Turkish texts printed in alphabets before Latinization and the Ottoman Archives of the Turkish Prime Ministry are the other important sources. According to them, Tilkiyan has 13 print titles, which render him a worthwhile author and publisher in consideration to the overall Armeno-Turkish print production. His role as translator and publisher, as well as author, indicates sixteen years of a lifetime

economic issues, qualifies for the output of an Ottoman intellectual. Before advancing on textual analysis, the format Tilkiyan published deserves a brief explanation. The Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire, especially the ones who resided in big cities, communicated in Turkish, with only a minority of them fluent in Armenian. In the preface of the Armeno-Turkish novel *Akabi Hikâyesi*, for instance, the author³ expresses his choice of Turkish due to the lack of Armenian-speaking Ottomans of Armenian origin. Therefore, it was habitual throughout the century that the Turkophone Armenians published in Turkish with Armenian letters. It was also customary that Turkish in Arabic script versions of many of these books were either simultaneously or consecutively printed (Ayaydın Cebe “19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Toplumı...”). This is the case with the *Shepherdesses*.

First, its Armeno-Turkish version was published in 1876 in Istanbul; then it appeared in Arabic letters the consecutive year. I have been pursuing both texts in aspiration to discover an early Turkish novel, as early as Şemsettin Sami’s narrative of two tragic lovers published in 1872, which is still accepted by many literary historians as the first of the genre in Turkish literature, despite historical facts that suggest otherwise. When I was able to get my hands on the Arabic script version of the *Shepherdesses*, it was 2016. This was a small book of 80 pages, narrating the rather dispersed stories of rural habitants whose life revolved around grazing sheep and suffering from love pangs. The setting was the meadows that lie on the border of Spain and Portugal; the names of the characters were somewhat of Latin origin, distorted according to Armeno-Turkish spelling. The title page indicated only Tilkiyan’s name as the creator of the work. And it was not uncommon that Ottoman authors wrote fiction where characters bear foreign names and live in foreign settings, the famous example being Ahmet Midhat’s “A Turk in Paris,” which he wrote without seeing the city itself. Therefore, the book may well be an original work of the author.

On the other hand, it was also a familiar practice that many Ottoman translators did not bother to cite their source in a period when authenticity was not the initial concern and when title pages did not require standards. This is a fact that complicates investigating the latest era of the Ottoman literature. Uncomfortable with that question in my mind, I decided to dig into texts from European literature, the main source of inspiration for the Ottoman authors. What eases this excavation, however, is that the Ottoman translators stuck to the original titles for most of the time. So, for a while, I was searching for shepherdesses and their possible versions over and under French, English, Italian, and Spanish narratives. I

actively dedicated to letters. Whether it is silenced after 1881 by personal choice or by death, we do not know of, yet.

³ According to Andreas Tietze, and to the widely embraced recognition thanks to his seminal work, the author of *Akabi Hikâyesi* is Vartan Paşa (Hovsep Vartanyan) whereas another argument by Yahya Erdem suggests that it might be Haçadur Vosganyan (Oskanyan). The validity of the latter is pending to be proven.

had to be sure before I published a monograph on this little book when the name of the heroine, “Galateya,” which remains the same in all the narratives in question, shed light upon the corridors of the labyrinth.

Cervantes published a pastoral romance entitled *La Galatea* in 1585, as his first book. I rejoiced discovering the source until I found out that *La Galatea* had a rather complicated plot, with a crowd of characters and events compared to the humble adventures of Tilkiyan’s shepherdesses. Apart from the names of the main characters and the skeleton of the plot, it diverged largely from Cervantes’s narrative. Considering the fact that the intellectual inclinations of the 19th century Ottoman literary universe were centered around French, it was also quite unlikely that Tilkiyan knew of Cervantes, except maybe of his *Don Quixote*, let alone reading in Spanish. But then, having obtained the original title, I could initiate a sounder expedition. It was now easier to follow the path that led to the French version of the romance. Having remained in the shadow of *Don Quixote*’s achievement for nearly two centuries, *La Galatea* was rediscovered by the French author Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian in 1783. Florian, without failing to pay tribute to the original master, took the liberty to reconstruct the narrative and completed the otherwise unfinished first volume. It was no doubt that Tilkiyan followed Florian’s version except for taking the initiative to remodel it in order to make room for an utterly original episode. My curiosity, however, was not satiated pertaining to the question of the source. Why would Tilkiyan pretend to be the author instead of simply and fairly citing Florian?

An Ottoman enthusiast of literature from Albania fell into the equation when he found Florian’s *Galatée* convenient for his budding interest in translation. Şemseddin Sami, upon his arrival to Istanbul as a young clerk, began exercising translation in order to develop his language skills. He ended producing an almost *mot-à-mot* linguistic transfer of *Galatée* in 1873. To the surprise of the modern reader, his efforts in translation were severely criticized by his peers for their loyalty to the original text (for the details of the argument which includes Şemseddin Sami’s other translations such as *Les misérables*, see Levend 72-75). Contrary to Tilkiyan’s attitude, Şemseddin Sami concealed his name as translator on the title page. It is from his autobiography that one acquires the identity of the translator (“Tercüme-i Hâl” 227).

Şemseddin Sami’s translation was published three years before Tilkiyan’s Armeno-Turkish version of the *Shepherdesses*. Tilkiyan, having published in both Arabic and Armenian script, was no doubt a confident reader of Turkish in different alphabets. Despite the fact that Şemseddin Sami’s version is a solid candidate for Tilkiyan’s source, his modern understanding of translation, however, re-instigates the previous question. Furthermore, textual proof also suggests a different source. Marching towards the end of the historical journey, it is high time to take a closer look into the texts.

In the autobiographical narrative of Tiyolinde of Tilkiyan (Teolinda in Cervantes, Téolinde in Florian), she talks about how she passed her days before falling in love. She listened to the singing of birds and accompanied them; she picked bright red roses, lilies without stain, and variegated carnations: “je cueillois la rose vermillé, le lis sans tache, l’œillet bigarré” (48). This is how Florian puts it into pen. Şemsettin Sami on the other hand omits the details of the flowers and simply translates it as, “Ve gāh çiçek toplayarak desteler yapar idim” (4): And betimes I picked flowers and made bundles. In the *Shepherdesses*, nevertheless, although a good deal has been altered, the flowers are depicted in detail: “Kırmızı güller, beyāz zambaklar toplayarak” (5): By picking red roses and white lilies. This nuance indicates that Şemseddin Sami cannot be the only source for Tilkiyan, if at all.

At the depths of this excavation lies an Armenian translation of *Galatée* made by an N. Nuriyan in 1863 and printed in Istanbul (bibliographic record cited in Etmekjian 275). The unfortunate fact that I could not yet obtain this version dooms my quest to indeterminacy. In any case, it must be noted that Tilkiyan’s style of translation is so liberal as to never allow one to definitely determine the source text.

Cervantes and *La Galatea*

Having completed the historical tour, we may now get more acquainted with the texts. This time, in line with the chronology, Cervantes becomes the point of departure. When he wrote *La Galatea*, Spanish readership had been favoring pastoral romances over chivalry for some time (Fitzmaurice Kelly xx; Rennert 11). It is not hard to recognize behind this tendency the altering worldview of humanity brought by the Renaissance. The ordinary men and women demanded their right to heroism against the hyperbolic valiance of born-to-be heroes. None, however, should mistake the allegedly idle pastoral life-style for serenity. The notion of counter representation of whatever negativity the city held stuck with the life of the shepherd only after the Romantics. Realism was yet to possess the literary universe, that is after romanticism. Therefore, what initially determine the pastoral motive in the 16th century is *mimesis* disguised in allegory (for the history and definition of pastoral see Alpers; Ayaydın Cebe, *Cervantes’ten Tilkiyan’a...* 22-48; Gifford; Hiltner; Most). The life of the author, after all, did not fall short of his characters’ in eventful adventures. Furthermore, the pastoral convention required shepherds to be artful in poetry.

Cervantes was pushing 40 when he published *La Galatea*. It may be considered as a late age for a first book but young Miguel had other interests. According to sources such as *Britannica Academic*, Fitzmaurice Kelly and *World Heritage Encyclopedia*, he visited Italy, the cultural center of the Renaissance and indulged

himself with art, architecture and literature. He also served as a soldier. He was one of the Crusader marines who defeated the Ottoman navy in 1571 in the Battle of Lepanto. The combat cost him his left arm. Four years after the battle, he was caught by Ottoman pirates when he was sailing from Napoli to Barcelona as a royal courier. He was forced to five years of slavery in Algeria until his family gathered the ransom money for his liberation. He spent the rest of his life in Spain and worked on and off as an accountant and a tax collector, positions which gave him the opportunity to travel throughout Andalusia. Meanwhile he was imprisoned and excommunicated more than once. His later years yield little information except support of some patrons.

Don Quixote's quick success upon publication in 1605 surprised the author for the reason that he actually pinned his hopes upon *La Galatea*. It was published with the phrase that it is the first part (*primera parte*) aspired to be completed by a sequence. It is dedicated to the Italian aristocrat Ascanio Collona, an indicator of the author's close relationship with the Italian patronage as well as the narrow elite circle as the text's intended readership. Critics such as Elizabeth Rhodes and Shannon M. Polchow compare *La Galatea* to its contemporary romances and to *Don Quixote* only to find that it is the kernel of the writer's novelist genius. Rhodes thinks that the lack of the supernatural and the extraordinary dynamism embedded in the otherwise static pastoral space make the actively dwelling characters take initiative to struggle against life's odds. This emphasis on personal will signifies a transition from pastoral stereotypes to novelistic characters (353-59).

The romance consists of six books and a crowded cast of characters exceeding seventy in number. The relationship between the protagonists Galatea and Elicio forms the main narrative that holds the pieces of the side narratives. Though this may be the case, their love story is rendered a discarded frame at times when secondary stories take the lead and contribute to the future of the couple's love affair. I will try to summarize this voluminous narrative in keeping with the major headlines that concerns us in relation to the other three texts.

The first book begins with the song of Elicio. He chants his love to Galatea. His close friend Erastro is also in love with Galatea but instead of rivalry, the mates opt for an understanding that their love does not interfere with their friendship. While they are conversing about love they witness a shepherd murder another. Elicio runs after the armed murderer and inquires about the motives behind his act. Thus, the story begins with an extraordinary and violent event, antithetical to the expectation of peace and serenity. The next day, when Elicio and Erastro are grazing their sheep they come across with Galatea and her close friend Florise. This time, the female mates run into a weeping shepherdess. This is Teolinda, who lost her lover because of the physical similarity she shares with her twin sister. Now, she is wandering around to find her love and correct the misunderstanding.

The second book opens with Silerio's story. The shepherds, hearing the beautiful sound of a harp coming from a hermitage, are curious. They enter the cabin to find the hermit has fainted. The hermit is Silerio who tells them about himself and his best mate Timbrio. Silerio recounts that, on one of the days, Timbrio argued with a chevalier who in turn challenged him to a duel. Timbrio, in order to escape from a fatal confrontation fled from Xerez to Napoli. Silerio being ill at the time could not accompany his mate. When he recovered after a few days, he traced him to a port on the way, where he found out that Timbrio had been sentenced to death on a false accusation. He fought against the executioners with his sword that allowed Timbrio to escape but caused himself to be imprisoned. After a few days, the city was besieged by Turks and he was liberated when prisoners broke out. After his wounds were healed, he traced his mate to Napoli and found him there, this time in love. He figured out a solution to infiltrate the girl's house in order help his love-sick friend. Upon seeing her, he, too, fell in love with her but restrained his feelings for the sake of his friend.

Silerio continues his story in the third book. The aforementioned duel challenge is realized and complicates matters. Silerio takes the responsibility to inform Nisida, their mutual beloved, of its result. Nisida, because her father had banned Silerio and Timbrio from seeing his daughters as a result of a chain of events whose narration would require more space than necessary, warns Silerio not to step into the house. Instead, she asks him to wear a ribbon on his arm if Timbrio is victorious and approach the house from a visible distance. In the excitement of Timbrio's triumph, Silerio forgets to put on the mark and runs towards Nisida's residence. Nisida faints upon the lack of the ribbon and everyone mistakes her for dead. Timbrio leaves the place in agony. In feelings of guilt, Silerio runs after his mate when he learns that Nisida is still alive. Anguish turns into happiness only to reappear when Silerio fails to catch his mate in Napoli. A few days later, he hears from Nisida's family that she and her sister Blanca had set off to find Timbrio but had gone missing one night during travel. In depression, Silerio decides to devote himself to God and retreats to a hermitage. After Silerio shares his story with the shepherds that night, a wedding feast takes place which gathers the village folk together.

The fourth book presents another love story which is connected to Teolinda's twin sister. Because it is entirely omitted from the other versions, it will suffice to say that this narrative is inserted by the same technique that relies on coincidence. Shepherdesses Galatea and Florise first overhear a conversation, and then join in. The important part of the book is that it ends with them running into Elicio and his friends resting by a fountain in the company of three strangers, two ladies and a gentleman. During conversation they hear that one of the ladies is called Nisida and they figure out that the strangers are the friends of hermit Silerio.

In the fifth book, the story of Silerio comes to a resolution. He learns that in his absence Timbrio embarked on a ship to Spain in order to get away from Italy where he thought he lost his beloved. The ship was caught in a storm and obliged to return to the port where she had set sail. Meanwhile, Nisida, having learned that Timbrio was alive, set off to find him with her sister in company, disguised as pilgrims. Presuming that Timbrio might be in Spain, they sought a ship destined there. They embarked on Timbrio's ship which was repaired after the storm and ready to set sail. The lovers are thus reunited.

Their joy is disrupted by a raid by Turkish ships on their journey to Spain. Algerian slave master Arnaut Mami—who is a reference to the actual master of Cervantes when he was a slave—captures the fleet. The battle results in victory for the Turks. Timbrio is wounded while defending Nisida and Blanca and they are all enslaved. Nisida, while begging for Timbrio's life, tells the captain that he is a son of a well-to-do family. Motivated by the amount of the ransom he could get, the captain sees Timbrio's wounds tended. That night, a fierce storm drags the ship to Catalan shores. This time, the shipwrecked Turks are enslaved, and Timbrio and the sisters are liberated.

After the narration of the happenings, friends and lovers rejoice in reunion. The rivalry between the old mates resolve when Silerio agrees to marry Blanca who is as beautiful as her sister. The joy is conventionally short-lived. News of Galatea's fixed marriage arrives. Her father had promised her to a rich Portuguese. The shepherds, trying to overcome the shock of the news, recognize the village priest Telesio from afar and gather around him. It is the anniversary of the death of the poet Meliso the next day. The priest summons a commemoration in the village cemetery.

The sixth book opens with the commemoration. The gathering, preparations and the walk to the cemetery are told in detail. During the ritual, the muse Caliope appears suddenly and chants a song about the actual poets of the period. The commemoration lasts until sunrise. After they return to their village, the shepherds, as is habitual throughout the narrative, gather together to recite love poems and converse. Meanwhile another complicated side narrative is attached which is connected to Teolinda's story. It is also omitted in the following versions. Towards the end of the book, we read that Galatea's fiancé is pressing for the marriage. Having learned that she needs to leave in three days, she writes a letter to Elicio asking for help. Elicio calls fellow shepherds and they decide to visit Galatea's father to talk him out of his promise. The romance ends by the depiction of twenty or so riders headed towards Galatea's house at sunrise. Cervantes brings to a close by writing that he will conclude the adventures in a sequel if the first book is well-received.

Florian and *Galatée*

It is Florian, who, two centuries later, achieves the success Cervantes hoped for. Similar to his forebear, *Galatée* is Florian's first book. The dynamics that lied beneath the renewed literary taste brought by *Don Quixote* as criticism of former chivalric narratives seems to begin working in the opposite direction by the last quarter of the 18th century. The weight of the solemn, reason-driven literature of the Age of Enlightenment appears to be balanced by the emotion-driven world of the meek and faithful shepherds in Florian's pastoral romances. Where the former seeks human control over natural forces the latter bids living in harmony with nature.

To assert that *Galatée* is merely inspired by Cervantes would be to disregard the shadow of *La Galatea* over it, especially considering the fact that Florian literally translated most of it. On the other hand, it is not possible to define it as an adaptation because Florian confines himself to merely changing the spelling of the characters' names according to their French pronunciation. He does not opt for an alteration in cultural codes. It would also not be appropriate to identify it as a pure translation. Although it was justifiable for pre- and early-modern translators to dispose of the source text, Florian frankly labels his work as "imitation". His self-consciousness asks for a specific reception.

The negative association of the notion of imitation in the contemporary mind may originate from authenticity in literature being overrated by modernization. A quick survey of pre- and early-modern literatures would immediately reveal that authors were getting along very well with intertextuality, which was immanent to and even the reason for existence of almost any literary text. Contrary to modern expectations, literature developed through intertextual relationships where authors imitated other authors, poets wrote analogous pieces to other poets' work, an attitude which made literary genres, conventions and traditions possible. Modernization assumed a critical discourse built on the marginalization of early-modern works, especially since the 19th century onwards. This required the concealment of inspiring sources, fragmentation and diversification of interaction. Consequently, "similar" is degraded to the status of "fake" against "the original" which in return bore the negative connotation.

In order to define Florian's literary creation, we may borrow from early-modern terminology. In the Ottoman Divan literature, poets generally paid tribute to, or in a few cases scorned, their predecessors by writing parallels, called "nazire". Etymologically, this is derived from "nazar," look, glance. And "nazaran" the adverbial form means with regard to or in consideration. Therefore, nazire is a work written looking up to another work, created in consideration with another poet's creation. It is a strong way of showing respect to predecessors, which, in turn, traditionalizes them. It is simultaneously a challenge, which implies self-confidence disguised in humility, for at least a parallel, if not a better work of art.

Consequently, the nazire writer incorporates himself into the tradition. This is exactly what Florian achieves by writing *Galatée*.

Florian chose Cervantes's work that was secondary to *Don Quixote*, and rearranged it in his own literary view, keeping its form and theme, in accordance with the interests of his reader. He, in a sense, rewrote it. His choice is a demonstration of the respect he feels for Cervantes. Other signs of his admiration are the statement of the source in the cover, and the biography of Cervantes with an evaluation of his literary personality added to the romance as front piece. They all indicate that Florian accepted him as a grandiose precedent. However, the fact that he interferes with his work means that he also challenges the writer. In other words, Florian attempted to see if he can write Cervantes' work better than him. Upon publication, as Hannelore Flessa Jarauscha reveals, *Galatée* received positive evaluations widely from the French press and made 29 prints between the years 1784-1898 (36-37, 247.1). When his work was successful in the eyes of the reader, Florian proved that he wrote *La Galatea* better than Cervantes. Thus, he not only contributed to traditionalizing Cervantes and pastoralism, but also secured his place in literary history by achieving the status of a writer who is so competent as to improve the source work.

As mentioned earlier, Florian translated most of Cervantes' sentences. The character names are the same, except that Silerio is converted into Fabian, and Telesio into Salvador. The basic structure is preserved in all the adventures transferred from *La Galatea*. Some of the verse pieces are written by Florian, but the majority of the verse is translated. His interference with the text is largely due to the fact that it was uncompleted. He concentrated the six books of *La Galatea* into three, by removing some characters and diluting the intricate structure. He also discarded the long passages of literary conversation. In the fourth book, he wrote an end to the narrative, which can be summarized as follows: On their way to convincing Galatée's father, Aurelio, to take back his word for her marriage, Elicio and his friends come across with Portuguese footmen who have snatched Galatée. They fight, kill the men, and liberate her. Then, Elicio asks for Galatée's hand from Aurelio. When he is about to refuse pleading Elicio's poverty, Elicio's best friend Erastre, who has been away for a while from the village, arrives. He brings a large herd with him whom he collected from the other shepherds for Elicio. Seeing that Elicio is appreciated among his peers and now richer than he had been, Aurelio consents to their union.

Although the basic structure is the same, Florian has altered some details in order to both adapt the narrative to the culture of his period and to create a layer for literary reference. In *La Galatea*, for example, Silerio dresses like a "jester," grabs a guitar and tries to attract the attention of Nisida's family, while in *Galatée* Fabian disguises himself as a Spanish ex-slave who has just bought his freedom from the "heretics". He pretends to earn his living by playing the guitar and singing his

adventures. When he becomes famous, he succeeds in reaching Nisida. In the 16th century Spain, the jester who amused the elites by jesting, telling stories and playing tricks determined the fashion of entertainment. It seems to have lost its appeal in the 18th century France. Florian adapts the narrative to the taste of the period by changing the jester with the wandering story teller. At the same time, the fact that the story teller was a slave who regained his freedom, renders it a sophisticated referential gesture made to Cervantes.

In addition to such details, Florian also deviates from his source in terms of style and emphasis on certain themes. He deliberately foregrounds themes that are also reflected in *La Galatea*, but are overshadowed by the liveliness of the plot, such as the strong sense of friendship, loyalty to the family, especially the respect of the children for the father, benevolence and religiosity. Above all, in the end piece he wrote, all of the characters overcome difficult situations through their commitment, to reach the happy ending. Loyalty constitutes the key concept for all the themes. The value of friendship is measured by a high commitment even at the expense of death; by risking life for the friend's sake or by repressing love. The same is true of love; even if it is unrequited, even if it requires enduring any kind of torture, the beloved is never indispensable. For the very reason, loyalty is the foundation of the main conflict. In the last book, however, all conflict is resolved without hurting any of the parties who have suffered enough for their happiness. Nevertheless, it is achieved with the help of coincidences, not because of the actions or choices of the characters.

According to Jarausch, Florian, who finds his content-wise inspiration in Cervantes, follows Salomon Gessner's footsteps in style. He embraces the moralist framework of the Swiss poet instead of D'Urfé's and Fontenelle's heroic plot structures that mark the French pastoral (83). Jarausch argues that Florian constitutes a bridge between classicism and romanticism (7) and Gessner's influence displays itself as a tendency towards realism and naturalism (83, 84).

In my opinion, Florian seems to have blended classicist ideals with early romanticism. His moralism and emphasis on commitment are his idealistic side whereas the poetic justice in the end and restraining the characters' personalities in the values they represent are the romantic aspects. Although the critics have emphasized his realism, a careful reading reveals that Florian is not a better realist than Cervantes. In Florian, despite his more consistent and coherent style, one cannot see the attention Cervantes pays to the cause-and-effect relations.

Cervantes, for example, constructs the scene in which Nisida and Blanca pursue Timbrio, as a reasonable chain of events. First, he tells that Timbrio had to go back to the port from where he departed because of the storm that caused the ship to divert from its route. In other words, he compensates the progress of narrative time with a backward movement so that the girls can find Timbrio when they arrive at the port. Florian rewrites the scene in a less plausible manner. Nisida and

Blanche escape from the house and come to the port, where they set out on a boat and chase the ship that has been sailing already for two days. Though the author adds some details such as the girls' convincing the rowers with the jewels they brought with them, the fictive structure of that passage is weak both in terms of probability and morality.

Şemseddin Sami and *Galate*

As to the story of the romance in the Ottoman realm, one must initially mention the popularity Florian held among Ottoman readers. His fables were translated and serialized in various periodicals in the second half of the 19th century. Şemseddin Sami, as an unorthodox translator among his peers, opted for the "loyal" method in translation. Therefore, his version is almost a word for word transfer of Florian's text. That being said, some diversions from the source text reveal an attitude of appropriation. First of all, Şemseddin Sami "prosifies" the verse pieces. He prefers to rewrite the verse parts in paragraphs keeping the essential meaning. This may result from the difficulty in translating poetry because it requires more subtlety and preservation of formal features such as rhyme and meter. Although it is justifiable for that reason, it is still an interference with the source text and the pastoral. Pastoral's specific poetical convention is not reflected in translation.

Besides that, Şemseddin Sami occasionally discards phrases or sentences. Some of these omissions signify a means to plainer and clearer expressions in the target language. That said, there are also instances when the Ottoman translator omits or alters sentences regarding religion and Christian rituals. For example, when Blanche takes a glance at Fabian's hermitage, she sees a wooden crucifix. She kneels down before it and prays. Şemseddin Sami replaces the crucifix with a rosary and makes Blanche pray with her palms turned upwards as in the Islamic fashion. Similarly, during the narration of the commemoration in the fourth book, a passage is entirely discarded. It is where eight handsome children, dressed in linen robes, and crowned with flowers, bear with respect the holy water, the incensory, and the fire. Afterwards in the cemetery, Salvador communicates a ritual by walking around the poet's grave three times, chanting customary prayers and pouring holy water on the grave. In the Turkish version, the ritual is shortened to Salvador's praying with palms upwards by the grave. The details of his profession as the village priest are also removed. In this way, Şemseddin Sami purges the text off of Christian elements by either altogether discarding them or by replacing them with their Muslim counterparts.

The translator's interference reaches beyond these. He also occasionally adds some cultural idiosyncrasies. For instance, Elicio kisses an elderly man when he gets Galatée's crook back from him in exchange for a goat. The source text uses the

word *embrasser* which means simply “to kiss” (or “to hug”). Şemseddin Sami makes Elicio kiss the old man’s hand. The complete gesture in Turkish culture is kissing the hand of the elder and touching with it to the forehead. It is an indication of respect for the elderly or the reputable. The second part is not needed to be explicitly expressed. The reader would assume that it followed. In some instances, similarly, the translator inserts idioms of Islam such as “Genab-ı Hak” (God Almighty) or “hamd olsun” (praise be God’s), changes the harp to a violin, a jeweled necklace souvenir to an amulet. These interferences are perhaps better to be regarded as adaptative alterations. They may be justifiable when accepted as a means to overcome alienation on the behalf of the reader, to familiarize the Muslim and Turkish readership with a foreign culture, or perhaps to adjust the text for governmental supervision. From another angle, however, they signal self-censorship. This analysis reveals that the work of 19th century Ottoman Muslim translators should be investigated in their approach to religious elements when translating from Christian cultures.

Tilkiyan and Galateya

Contrary to Şemseddin Sami’s relatively loyal transfer, Tilkiyan’s *Shepherdesses* is a rewriting, in the fashion of the typical Ottoman notion of translation⁴. Done by a non-Muslim translator, this text is surprisingly purified of religious elements but augmented in morals. Tilkiyan, above all, changes the title of the romance and does not indicate that it is a translation. He also alters some of the character’s names: Elicio becomes Civan, Erastre becomes Vizant. Most of the rest is written close to French pronunciation but with Armeno-Turkish spelling: Ardidor, Blanka, Fabya, Galateya, Lidya, Meris, Timurya, Tiyolinda. What requires attention is that names of the leading male characters also end with an “a,” which is an indication of femininity in Latin languages. The setting is generally preserved but some of the places’ names are distorted.

Tilkiyan’s language is poorer than Şemseddin Sami’s in grammar, punctuation and spelling. There are several incoherencies some of which seem to result from typographical errors. The text, however, is richer in idioms. Its language is closer to colloquial discourse which deviates it from the elitist literary language identified with its ample use of Persian clauses and prepositional constructions.

Tilkiyan substantially shortens the narrative by omitting Galateya’s best friend Florise, some secondary characters such and Tircis and Damon, and consequently cleanses the narrative of the stories pertaining to them. The wedding feast and commemoration scenes are also excluded and Tiyolinda’s story is left

⁴ Most of the research on translation studies in the Ottoman era focuses exclusively on the works of Ottoman-Turkish and Muslim authors who print in Arabic alphabet. See Altuğ; Bengi-Öner; Demircioğlu; Karadağ; Uluğtekin.

uncompleted. Galateya and Civan are mutually in love from the beginning onwards. The obstacle to their union is Vizant, who is depicted as a rival. The book ends after Timurya and the sisters find their friend Fabya. Similar to Tiyyolinda's pending conclusion, Galateya and Civan's marriage is not narrated. Only Fabya and Blanka are engaged, and the text ends with the statement that all lived happily in the village for the rest of their lives. The most detailed story transferred from the source text is Fabya's. Nevertheless, the conflict between friends created by falling in love with the same girl is erased. Instead, Fabya first likes Nizida but upon seeing her sister is as beautiful, he falls in love with Blanka.

Tilkiyan shortens the narrative, however, interestingly enough, he adds an altogether authentic story. It can be taken for Tilkiyan's own for it exists neither in *La Galatea* nor in *Galatée*, and an investigation of the contemporary French and Ottoman literature has not yielded a similar narrative. This story, moreover, resembles Tilkiyan's tragedy *Sıdk-ı Canan* in theme, technique, and characterization. It is inserted into Nizida's story as a misadventure of her close friend Jozepina. It can be regarded as a variation of the original confidence between the sisters. It is the second largest narrative after Fabya's story.

Nizida begins telling Jozepina's story as an explanation why her father forbids Nizida meeting her lover Timurya. Jozepina is a young girl who lost her mother and lives with her father in a small, two-bedroom house. She entertains her lover Antuvan secretly in her bedroom at nights. The despot father wants her to marry the rich but old, ugly and rude Anderya. The inclusion of such a character may be treated as a reproduction of the original theme of the money of the wealthy (the Portuguese who asked for Galatea's hand) versus the love of the poor (Elicio).

In Jozepina's story, as well as in some points in the general narrative, functions bestowed upon spatial elements such as windows, doors and gardens do not exist in the source texts. They indicate a structure of human relations peculiar to the Ottoman culture. In *Galatée*, characters meet in open spaces such as fountain sides, stream banks, meadows, the cemetery, and large pieces of land where, for instance, the wedding feast is held. Enclosed spaces such as the inside of houses do not usually take place and if occasionally mentioned, they are not depicted in detail. Accordingly, indoors is not positioned in opposition to outdoors. Doors or windows are not paid special attention. The only instance when the window is given an eminent function is the part where Elicio removes the cherry tree from his garden and transfers it to Galatea's. He plants it in front of Galatea's window very carefully not to disturb the nestle on it. Here, the window is not structured as a threshold which simultaneously separates and merges the private and the public. It is rather a symbol of Elicio's dreams of building a family. Doors, on the other hand, are either open or immediately opened when someone knocks.

In the story of Jozepina and in some other details Tilkiyan added to the narrative, windows and doors— and house gardens as a variant of them in terms of ascribed

meaning— serve as a threshold between the interior and the exterior to reinforce the opposition arising from the fact that one is private and the other is public. Male characters wander about the door of their beloved's house, and young females communicate with them through the window via gazes and gestures. Doors do not only keep the house separate from the street, they also divide the interior space according to the degree of privacy; room doors are kept closed and even locked when necessary. This perception of space suggests that gender relations are regulated with a discriminatory mindset. In the Ottoman literature, the functions ascribed to spatial elements are similar in the artefacts of written and oral culture. This arrangement of space indicates an imagination of a society that is intrinsic to the Ottoman culture to whom authors from different ethnic and religious backgrounds contribute. This is also the most distinctive aspect of Jozepina's story that convinces one to accept it as an original creation of Tilkiyan.

Shepherdesses, in which patriarchal moralism is emphasized more strongly than Florian's text, sheds light on the social imagination of Tilkiyan. Some expressions that the author inserts reveal an understanding of morality that regulates the relationship between parents and children, protects honor and advocates obedience to the father. For example, Tiyolinda's parents, who are not mentioned in the source text, are added in a way that reinforces the importance of chastity. When Tiyolinda falls into sleep in the meadows while grazing the sheep, her parents worry and go out looking for her. When they find her, the father warns her not to fall asleep again, alone, in such a manner. Tiyolinda tells him that there is no harm in doing so, that she has always slept in the open when grazing the sheep. His father replies: "Look what she says. No girl-kind sleeps alone in desolate places like that" (7). Consequently, through discriminatory discourse, the issue of sexual honor as the responsibility of the female is embedded in the narrative, a conception, which is non-existent in the source text. Similarly, the detail attached to the reason why Nizida wants Fabya to report the result of the duel by attaching a ribbon on his arm has the same function. As Nizida knows that his father is always at home and most likely to be around her, she tells Fabya that he cannot report the result of the duel to her directly, so that they should set a mark for it (43). This reveals the existence of a convention based on an understanding of privacy that bans an unrelated man from meeting a girl in the presence of her father.

Contrary to this deliberate moralist framework, the *Shepherdesses* is totally liberated from religious connotations. Fabya retreats to a cave, instead of a hermitage, and since passages about the wedding and tomb visit have been discarded, there are no descriptions of religious officials and rituals. The characters do not pray, and they mention God's name only three times in the cultural context: "God forbid" (maazallah) (43), "for God's sake" (Allah aşkına) (60) and "God willing" (Allah vere idi de) (62).

These observations are illuminating in comprehending the concept of translation in the Ottoman mind. The changes that texts undergo while being transferred from the source to the target language shed light on the level of the mimetic tendencies of the translator. The relationship established with reality must be considered from the angles of both the reality of the source text and the reality of the translator. As I discuss elsewhere, the Ottoman way of translation appropriated source texts (“To Translate or Not to Translate...” 215). Saliha Paker sees this self-proclaimed behavior, which changes the titles, characters, plots, and even genres of the source texts, as an understanding stemming from the “imperialist” mindset. She interprets it as an extension of the traditional assimilation policy of the Ottoman Empire (330).

In support of a small number of research on non-Muslim Ottoman translators (e.g. Karra; Şişmanoğlu Şimşek) the findings obtained here reveal an ethnically or religiously independent understanding of Ottoman translation. Consequently, when historicizing the 19th century, an age when literary and cultural modernization undoubtedly pivoted on European literature, it would be naïve and short-sighted not to question the Eurocentric historiography of Ottoman literature, after recognizing that the Ottoman translator was not a passive transporter but an effective transformer, who, more often than not, considered translation as a means for intertextual creativity.

Works Cited

- Ahmed Midhat. *Paris’de Bir Türk*. Kırk Anbar Matbaası, 1293 [1876].
- Alpers, Paul. *What is Pastoral?* University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Altuğ, Fatih. “19. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Edebiyatında İmparatorluk Medeniyet Yerlilik Yaban(cı)lık ve Din.” *Tanzimat ve Edebiyat: Osmanlı İstanbul’unda Modern Edebi Kültür*, edited by Mehmet Fatih Uslu ve Fatih Altuğ, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014, pp. 65-114.
- Ayaydın Cebe, Günil Özlem. *Cervantes’ten Tikiyan’a Osmanlı Edebiyatında Pastoralin Sergüzeşti*. Grafiker Yayınları, 2016.
- . *19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı Toplumunu ve Basılı Türkçe Edebiyat: Etkileşimler, Değişimler, Çeşitlilik*. 2009. Bilkent University, PhD dissertation.
- . “To Translate or Not to Translate? 19th Century Ottoman Communities and Fiction.” *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 56, no. 2, 2016, pp. 187-222.
- Bengi-Öner, Işın. “Bir Söz Ustası ve Bir Devrimci: Ahmed Midhat Efendi.” *Çeviri Bir Süreçtir... Ya Çeviribilim?* Sel Yayıncılık, 1999, pp. 67-76.
- . “Türk Edebiyatında La Dame aux camelias Çevirileri.” *Çeviri Bir Süreçtir... Ya Çeviribilim?* Sel Yayıncılık, 1999, pp. 45-66.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *Primera parte de la Galatea, dividida en seys libros*. Alcalá de Henares, Imprenta de Juan Gracián, 1585.
- Demircioğlu, Cemal. “19. Yüzyıl Sonu Türk Edebiyatında ‘Tercüme’ Kavramı.” *Journal of Turkish Studies* vol. 27, no. 2, 2003, pp. 13-31.

- . *From Discourse to Practice: Rethinking 'Translation' (Terceme) and Related Practices of Text Production in the Late Ottoman Literary Tradition*. 2005. Boğaziçi University, PhD dissertation.
- . "Translating Europe: The Case of Ahmed Midhat as an Ottoman Agent of Translation." *Agents of Translation*, edited by John Milton and Paul Bandia, John Benjamins Publishing, 2009, pp. 131-59.
- Erdem, Yahya. "Haçadur Vosganyan ve Eseri: 'Sultan ve Halkı'-1857." *Müteferrika*, vol. 31, Summer 2007, pp. 37-54.
- Etmekjian, James. *The French Influence on the Western Armenian Renaissance 1843-1915*. Twayne Publishers, 1964.
- Fitzmaurice Kelly, Jas. "Introduction to the Galatea." *Galatea. The Complete Works of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra Volume II*, by Miguel de Cervantes, edited by Jas Fitzmaurice Kelly, translated by H. Olsner and A. B. Welford, Cowans and Gray, 1903, pp. viii-viii.
- Florian, Jean-Pierre Claris de. *Galatée, Roman Pastoral imité de Cervantes*. 4th edition, L'Imprimerie de Didot, 1789.
- . *Galate: Galatée par Florian*, translated by Şemseddin Sami, Zartaryan Fabrikası, 1290 [1873].
- Gifford, Terry. *Pastoral*. Routledge, 1999.
- Hiltner, Ken. *What Else is Pastoral? Renaissance Literature and the Environment*. Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Jaraus, Hannelore Flessa. *Beyond the Idyllic Imagination: A Critical Study of Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian 1755-1794*. 1972. University of Wisconsin, PhD dissertation.
- Karadağ, Ayşe Banu. "Batı'nın Çevrilmesi Üzerine: Tanzimat Dönemi/Sonrası Çevirilerini 'Medeniyet' Odağıyla Yeniden Okumak." *Kritik* vol. 2, Fall 2008, pp. 306-24.
- Karra, Anthi. "From *Polypathis* to *Temaşa-i Dünya*, from the Safe Port of Translation to the Open Sea of Creation." *Cries and Whispers in Karamanlidika Books: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Karamanlidika Studies (Nicosia, 11th-13th September 2008)*, edited by Evangelia Balta and Matthias Kappler, Harrossowitz Verlag, 2010, pp. 201-18.
- Levend, Agâh Sırrı. *Şemsettin Sami*. Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1969.
- "Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra." *World Heritage Encyclopedia*. community.worldbooklibrary.org. Accessed 17 September 2016,
- Most, Glenn W. "Daphnis in Grasmere: Wordsworth's Romantic Pastoral." *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, edited by Mark Griffith and Donald J. Mastrorarde, Scholars Press, 1990, pp. 361-85.
- Özege, M. Seyfettin. *Eski Harflerle Basılmış Türkçe Eserler Kataloğu I-V*. Fatih Yayınevi, 1971-1979.
- Paker, Saliha. "Ottoman Conceptions of Translation and Its Practice: The 1897 'Classics Debate' as a Focus for Examining Change." *Translating Others*, vol. 2, edited by Theo Hermans, St. Jerome Publishing, 2006, pp. 325-48.
- Polchow, Shannon M. "La Galatea: The Embryonic Manifestation of Cervantes's Narrative Genius." *Hispania* vol. 93, no. 2, June 2010, pp. 165-76.

- Rennert, Hugo A. *The Spanish Pastoral Romances*. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, 1912.
- Rhodes, Elizabeth. "Sixteenth-century Pastoral Books, Narrative Structure, and *La Galatea* of Cervantes." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* vol. 66, no. 4, 1 October 1989, pp. 351-60.
- Riley, Edward C. and Anne J. Cruz. "Miguel de Cervantes." *Britannica Academic*. 20 June 2016, academic.eb.com. Accessed 17 September 2016.
- Stepanyan, Hasmik A. *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Kitaplar ve Süreli Yayınlar Bibliyografyası (1717-1968)*. Turkuaz Yayınları, 2005.
- [Stepanyan] İsdepanyan, H. A. *Ermeni Harfli Türkçe Kitapların Listesi: 1727-1968*. Ermenistan SSC (Sovyet Sosyalist Cumhuriyeti) Bilimler Akademisi Yayınevi, 1985.
- Şemseddin Sami. *Taaşuk-ı Talat ve Fitnat*. El-Cevaib Matbaası, 1289 (1872).
- . ["Tercüme-i Hâl"]. *Servet-i Fünun* vol. 275, 6 Haziran 1312 (18 Haziran 1896), pp. 227-28.
- Şişmanoğlu Şimşek, Şehnaz. "The *Yeniçeriler* of Ioannis Gavriilidis: A Palimpsest in Karamanlidika." *Between Religion and Language: Turkish-Speaking Christians, Jews and Greek-Speaking Muslims and Catholics in the Ottoman Empire*, edited by Evangelia Balta and Mehmet Ölmez, Eren Yayıncılık, 2011, pp. 245-75.
- Tilkiyan, Viçen. *Çoban Kızlar*. Samuel Bardizbanyan, 1876.
- . *Çoban Kızlar*. İzzet Efendi Matbaası, 1294 (1877).
- . *Sıdk-ı Canan*. Dican Beleknan, 1293 (1876).
- Uluğtekin, Melahat Gül. *Ahmet Vefik Paşa'nın Çevirilerinde Osmanlılaşan Molière*. 2004. Bilkent University, MA Thesis.
- Vartan Paşa [Hovsep Vrtanyan]. *Akabi Hikayesi*, 1851, edited by A. Tietze, Eren Yayıncılık, 1991.